

REMARKS

The present amendment is a supplemental response to the Office Action dated November 2, 2006. Claims 8-10, 39-41 and 62-95 are now present in this case. No claims have been amended in the present response. However, all claims are included herewith for the Examiner's convenience. New claims 72-95 are added.

The rejection of claims 8-10, 39-41, and 62-71 were discussed in the response filed on February 1, 2006. Those arguments need not be repeated herein.

New claims 72-95 are also allowable over the references of record in the case. Specifically, Welles does teach or suggest providing service information to a master messaging platform or converting information received to a delivery format specified in the service information and providing the requested information to the subscriber in the specified delivery format, as recited in new claim 72. Bohm discloses the use of a token in a token ring network, but does not teach or suggest the conversion of received information to a specified delivery format and providing the requested information to the subscriber in the specified delivery format, as recited in claim 72. Accordingly, claim 72 is clearly allowable over the cited references. Dependent claims 73-77 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 72, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Similarly, the cited references do not suggest the method recited in independent claim 78. Specifically, the combination of references do not teach or suggest "converting the received information to a delivery format specified in the received service information if the requested information from the information source is received in a format other than the specified delivery format," as well as "delivering the requested information to the subscriber in the specified delivery format," as recited in claim 78. Therefore, claim 78 is allowable over the cited references. Dependent claims 79-83 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from 78, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claim 84 is an apparatus claim wherein a messaging computer is "configured to respond to any information received from the information source by converting the received information to have a delivery format corresponding to a delivery format specified in the service information." As noted above, the cited references, taken alone or combination, do not teach or suggest the apparatus of claim


84. Accordingly, claim 84 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 85-91 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 84, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Finally, claim 92 is a means plus function claim and recites *inter alia* "means for converting the information received from the master messaging platform to have a delivery format corresponding to a delivery format selected by the subscriber." As discussed above, the cited references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest any conversion of a delivery format, as recited in claim 92. Therefore, claim 92 is clearly allowable over the cited references. Claims 93-95 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 92, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. The applicants have made a good faith effort to place all claims in condition for allowance. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 628-7640.

Respectfully submitted,

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP



Michael J. Donohue
Registration No. 35,859

MJD:gatc
2600 Century Square
1501 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101-1688
Phone: (206) 622-3150
Fax: (206) 628-7699

1763058_1.DOC 67771-5